

### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the remarks and analysis contained in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

#### **The objection to the drawings can be withdrawn.**

Applicant submits Replacement Sheets for the drawings including changes to Figures 3A, 3B and 5. The changes to Figures 3A and 3B eliminate the problems that the Examiner noted on page 2 of the Office Action regarding the reference characters 52 and 54. Those reference characters no longer appear in Figures 3A and 3B. Further, those reference characters are used appropriately in Figure 4.

The specification has been amended to reflect the different reference characters now appearing in Figures 3A and 3B. Those amendments to the specification do not present any new matter. Applicant respectfully requests approval of the amended sheet of drawings and entry of the amendments to the specification made above.

With regard to the objection to Figure 5, the elements labeled 86 and 88 have been deleted from that figure and the surface contour on the detail 40 has been amended to render it more consistent with the description. Applicant notes that the drawings are schematic in nature and that exacting detail is not required. For the sake of consistency, however, the contour has been added to Figure 5.

Applicant respectfully requests approval and acceptance of the Replacement Sheet including the amended version of Figure 5. No new matter has been entered.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn as all issues raised by the Examiner have been addressed.

**The rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)  
must be withdrawn.**

It is not reasonable to take Applicant's description of a preferred embodiment and import that into the prior art. That is what the Examiner is doing by stating that limitations in Applicant's claims that are not found in the *Bruyneel, et al.* reference are somehow "inherently" in that reference.

There is nothing in the *Bruyneel, et al.* reference that in any way suggests any inspection of any of the cords. It is not reasonable to assert that it is inherently found in that reference. Additionally, there is nothing in Applicant's description that in any way suggests Applicant's technique would be applied to the *Bruyneel, et al.* reference. The statement that a detector can be a known type of device in Applicant's description in no way lends any credence to the Examiner's position that something that is completely missing from the *Bruyneel, et al.* reference is somehow "inherently" in that reference.

Even if there were some basis for the Examiner's "inherent" argument, that still does not provide any basis for finding the claim step of manipulating a broken wire end to prevent that wire end from protruding as included in Applicant's independent claims. Additionally, many of Applicant's dependent claims recites specific techniques that are in no way inherently disclosed or in any way even remotely suggested by the *Bruyneel, et al.* reference.

There is no *prima facie* case of anticipation. The rejection must be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Gaskey', is written over a horizontal line.

David J. Gaskey  
Registration No. 37,139  
400 W. Maple, Suite 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: October 20, 2009

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\IP00127 PUS1\PATENT\Response 10-09.doc